

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

Claim 20 has been amended by incorporating therein the subject matter of claim 21.

There is no disclosure or teaching in Shepherd et al., Watanabe et al., Shoyama and Ueyoko et al. of combining yarns having respective elasticity moduli of at least 2000 cN/tex and at most 1500=N/tex. As noted on page 3, lines 15+, the elastic modulus of a yarn is a function, not only of the material of which the yarn filaments are formed, but also the degree to which the filaments are twisted. Yarns of identical filaments can have much different moduli depending upon the twisting. Therefore, the mere fact that the yarns of the presently claimed invention use filaments similar to those of Shepherd et al. does not mean that the yarns of Shepherd et al. will have similar elastic moduli as recited in amended claim 20.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the combination of references applied against the claims cannot be considered as teaching the invention of amended claim 20.

The combination of claims 20 and 21 also overcomes the rejection based upon new matter.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: April 2, 2007

By:


Alan E. Kopecki
Registration No. 25813

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620